

Washington Wildlife & Recreation Program
Evaluation Criteria

Local Parks Category

Local Parks provide property or facilities for active or passive outdoor recreation. They may contain both upland and water oriented elements, although their primary focus is on uplands and/or swimming pools.

IAC Manual 10.

WWRP - Local Parks Criteria Analysis					
Score	#	Title	A/D	Mult/Mx	Focus
Team	1	Public Need	A/D	3/15.0	Local
Team	2	Project Scope	A/D	3/15.0	Local
Team	3	Project Design	D	3/15.0	Tech
Team	4	Immediacy of Threat	A	2/10.0	Local
Team	5	Site Suitability	A	1/5.0	Tech
Team	6	Expansion/Renovation	A/D	1/5.0	Local
Team	7	Project Support	A/D	2/10.0	St/Loc
Team	8	Cost Efficiencies	A/D	1/5.0	St/Loc
IAC Staff	9	GMA Preference	A/D	1/0	State
IAC Staff	10	Population Proximity	A/D	0.5/5.0	State
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE				A = 70 / D = 70	

KEY:

IAC Staff = Criteria scored by *IAC staff*
 Team = Criteria scored by interdisciplinary evaluation *team*
 A/D = Acquisition or Development specific question
 Mult/Mx = Multiplier and maximum points possible for this criterion
 St/Loc/Tech = State priority, local priority, or technical consideration
 SCORP = Statewide comprehensive outdoor recreation plan
 Focus = *St/Loc/Tech*; Criteria orientation in accordance with SCORP policy of developing evaluation systems based on three need factors: those that meet general *statewide* needs (often called for in RCW or SCORP), those that meet *local* needs (usually an item of narrower purview, often called for in local plans), and those that meet *technical* considerations (usually more objective decisions than those of policy).

WWRP SCORING CRITERIA

Local Parks

Team Scored

1. **PUBLIC NEED. Considering the availability of existing outdoor recreation facilities within the service area, what is the need for new or improved facilities?**

Acquisition/Development, *Assessment of Outdoor Recreation in Washington State, 2002-2007*, Chapter 5.

Establish the recreation need by inventorying all available outdoor recreation opportunities (quality/quantity) within the service area. In general, areas with fewer outdoor recreation sites will score higher than those with more. In addition, consider whether or not the project is named by location or type as a priority in an adopted plan.

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 3.

Revised May 2003

2. **PROJECT SCOPE. Does the project scope meet deficient recreational opportunities within the service area as identified in question one, Public Need?**

Acquisition/Development

This question seeks to determine how well the scope of the specific project satisfies the recreation need(s) identified in question one. Projects that more fully satisfy identified need(s) will score higher than those that do less.

Normally, projects offering a variety of recreation opportunities particularly in service areas with few opportunities will score higher than those offering few or a single opportunity. However, if a single significant need is identified in question one and strongly met as a single element, the project can score well on this question.

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 3.

3. **PROJECT DESIGN. Does the project demonstrate good design criteria; does it make the best use of the site?**

Development

Measure the quality of the functional and aesthetic aspects of the site design as related to the site and the proposed uses. Will site resources be appropriately made available for recreation? Will environmental or other important values be protected by the proposed development? Consider the size, topography, soil conditions, natural amenities, and location of the site to determine if it is well suited for the intended uses. Some design elements that may be considered include:

- Accuracy of Cost Estimates
- Aesthetics
- Maintenance
- Materials
- Phasing
- Recreation Experiences
- Risk Management
- Site suitability
- Space Relationships
- User Friendly/Barrier Free

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 3.

Revised April 2004

4. **IMMEDIACY OF THREAT. Is there a threat to the public availability of the resources the site possesses?**

Acquisition

Consider the availability of alternatives. Where none exist, the significance of a threat may be higher.

- a. No evidence presented (0 points)
- b. *Minimal threat*; site resource opportunity appears to be in no immediate danger of a loss in quality or to public use *in the next 36 months*(1-2 points)
- c. Actions are under *consideration* that *could* result in the opportunity losing quality or becoming unavailable for public use (3 points)
- d. *Actions will be taken* that will result in the opportunity losing quality or becoming unavailable for future public use
or
A threat situation has occurred or is imminent and has led a *land trust* to acquire rights in the land at the request of the applicant agency.....(4-5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 2.

Revised April 2004

5. **SITE SUITABILITY. Is the site to be acquired well suited for the intended recreational uses?**

Acquisition

Compare the site's physical features against the proposed use. Consider the size, topography, soil conditions, natural amenities, and location of the site to determine if it is well suited for the intended uses. In general, sites most compatible to the uses proposed score higher.

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1.

Revised April 2004

6. **EXPANSION/RENOVATION. Will the acquisition or development project expand or renovate an existing recreation area or facility?**

Acquisition/Development, *Assessment of Outdoor Recreation in Washington State, 2002-2007*, Chapters 1 & 5.

Recognizes that expansion/renovation projects generally provide greater benefit-to-cost ratios than new projects. Projects that add to existing assets also often provide greater management flexibility and resource diversity.

Point Range: 0-5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1.

Revised May 2003

7. **PROJECT SUPPORT. The extent that the public (statewide, community, and/or user groups) has been provided with an adequate *opportunity to become informed*, and/or *support for the project* seems apparent.**

Acquisition/Development

Broadly interpret the term *project support* to include, but not be limited to:

- (1) Extent of efforts by the applicant to identify and contact all parties, i.e. an outreach program to local, regional, and statewide entities.
- (2) The extent that there is project support, including:
 - Voter approved initiatives/bond issues/referenda
 - Ordinance and resolution adoption
 - Public meeting attendance
 - Endorsements or other support from advisory boards and user/"friends" groups
 - Media coverage
 - The extent to which the public was involved in a comprehensive planning process that includes this project.

- a. No evidence presented (0 points)
- b. Marginal community support. Opportunities for only minimal public involvement (i.e. a single adoption hearing),
and/or
Little evidence that the public supports the project (1-2 points)
- c. Adequate support (3 points)
- d. The public has received ample and varied opportunity to provide meaningful input into the project, and there is overwhelming support;
and/or
The public was so supportive from the project's inception that an extensive public participation process was not necessary (4-5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 2.

Revised March 1997

8. **COST EFFICIENCIES. The extent that this project demonstrates efficiencies and/or reduces government costs through documented use of:**

- **Volunteers,**
- **Donations,**
- ***Signed* cooperative agreements or**
- ***Signed* memoranda of understanding (such as no cost easements/leases, maintenance/operation arrangements, or similar cost savings).**

Acquisition/Development, *Assessment of Outdoor Recreation in Washington State 2002-2007*, Chapter 5.

- a. No evidence presented.(0 point)
- b. The benefit of any such agreement is *marginal*.....(1-2 points)
- c. Cooperative measure(s) will result in *moderate* efficiencies and/or savings. (3 points)
- d. Cooperative measure(s) will result in *substantial* efficiencies and/or savings.(4-5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1.

Revised May 2003

PRESCORED BY IAC STAFF

9. GMA PREFERENCE. Has the applicant made progress toward meeting the requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA)?

RCW 43.17.250 (GMA-preference required.)

State law requires that:

- (1) Whenever a state agency is considering awarding grants to finance public facilities, it shall consider whether the applicant[†] has adopted a comprehensive plan and development regulations as required by RCW 36.70A.040 (“state law”).
- (2) When reviewing such requests, the state agency shall accord additional preference to applicants[†] that have adopted the comprehensive plan and development regulations. An applicant[†] is deemed to have satisfied the requirements for adopting a comprehensive plan and development regulations if it:
 - Adopts or has adopted within the time periods specified in state law;
 - Adopts or has adopted by the time it requests a grant or loan; or
 - Demonstrates substantial progress toward adopting within the time periods specified in state law. An agency that is more than six months out of compliance with the time periods has not demonstrated substantial progress.
- (3) A request from an applicant[†] planning under state law shall be accorded no additional preference based on subsection (2) over a request from an applicant[†] not planning under this state law.

This question is pre-scored by IAC staff based on information obtained from the state Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development, GMA Division. To qualify for the current grant cycle, the GMA comprehensive plan and development regulations must be completed by IAC’s Technical Completion Deadline.

- a. The applicant does *not* meet the requirements of RCW 43.17.250(minus 1 point)
- b. The applicant *meets* the requirements of RCW 43.17.250 (0 points)
- c. The applicant is a nonprofit organization, state or federal agency (0 points)

IAC staff subtracts a maximum of 1 point; there is no multiplier.

Revised July 1999

[†] County, city, town, and special district applicants only. This segment of the question does not apply to state agency applicants.

Prescored

10. **PROXIMITY TO HUMAN POPULATIONS. Where is this project located with respect to urban growth areas, cities/towns, and county density?**

Acquisition/Development: RCW 79A.25.250 (IAC urban area parks)

This question is scored by IAC staff based on a map provided by the applicant. To receive credit, the map must describe the project area and contain a circle with a five-mile radius. As its hub, the circle must use the point on the project's boundary closest to a city or town. The single city or town (if any, including urban growth area boundary) with the highest population touched by the circle is counted in part "a," below. The result from "a" (cities) is added to the result from "b" (counties). This takes into account that counties with high *average* densities are made up of both high and low density areas. Projects located near cities over 5000 population *and* within high density counties receive points from both "a" and "b".

- a. Within 5 miles of a GMA urban growth area boundary or the boundary of an incorporated city/town. In either case, the score is based on the city/town population (OFM):

▶	0 -	4,999.....	(0 points)
▶	5,000 -	9,999	(1 point)
▶	10,000 -	29,999.....	(2 points)
▶	30,000 -	149,999	(3 points)
▶	150,000 -	299,999.....	(4 points)
▶	300,000 -	and above	(5 points)

- b. In a county with a population density (OFM) of:

▶	0 -	249.....	(0 points)
▶	250 -	324	(1 point)
▶	325 -	399.....	(2 points)
▶	400 -	474	(3 points)
▶	475 -	549.....	(4 points)
▶	550 -	and above	(5 points)

IAC staff awards a maximum of 10 points that are later multiplied by 0.5

Revised May 2003

Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program

Outdoor Recreation Account

Instructions for Evaluators:

Score All. To ensure statistical parity among projects, each evaluator will score *all* proposals. While interpretation of team-scored criteria is at the discretion of individual evaluators, the guidelines in each instrument should be used.

Consistency. Individual team members may consider different aspects of projects important. Some evaluators may give high scores all the way through, while others may give lower scores. It is most important, however, that each evaluator score all projects in a consistent manner throughout the rating process.

Judge the Evidence. Final scores will depend on an evaluator's personal appraisal of, and confidence in, the information presented. Weak or unsubstantiated claims will be scored accordingly.

Voice Opinions. Evaluators are expected to discuss each proposal with other team members and presenters. Active participation and critical thinking is important. Comments on strengths, weaknesses and the number of evaluation points that should be awarded are all encouraged. Comments, however, must remain pertinent to the current project.

Two forms are supplied to assist evaluators:

1. WWRP SCORING CRITERIA pages will not be collected from team members. These guidelines are for use during the presentations. Evaluators should consult them for project scoring advice.
2. PROJECT SCORE SUMMARY pages on which evaluators will record all scores. Evaluators will award *whole number* scores for each criteria; no fractions, please. These pages will be collected at the end of this category and at the end of each day. This procedure is designed to allow team members time to check consistency by reviewing individual scores awarded in each category.

After collecting the Score Summary sheets, *IAC staff will* factor in multipliers, total all scores, and list projects in final rank order.

Revised March 1998